UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:08-CR-20 CAS
V.)	
)	
)	
CALVIN JUNIOR BRADEN,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on various pretrial matters. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), this Court referred all pretrial matters to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas C. Mummert, III. On April 18, 2008, Judge Mummert filed an Order and Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge which recommended that defendant's Motion for Disclosure of Informant and Motion to Suppress Evidence be denied.

Defendant Braden filed a general objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order and Report and Recommendation on April 25, 2008. Defendant objected generally to the Order and Report and Recommendation. The entirety of the objection is as follows: "Defendant objects to the Report and Recommendations filed by the magistrate judge and states that he wishes to preserve all of the issues raised in said report and in Defendant's pre-trial motions for appeal." This type of general objection is of little aid to the Court in focusing on any errors which may have been made by the Magistrate Judge. The Court is mindful, however, that the Eighth Circuit has repeatedly emphasized the necessity of de novo review. See, e.g., Hudson v. Gammon, 46 F.3d 785, 786 (8th Cir. 1995). The Court therefore assumes that defendant's general objection is sufficient to require de novo review.

The Court has carefully and independently reviewed the full record, and has listened to recording of the evidentiary hearing held in this matter on April 16, 2008. The Court is in full agreement with the stated rationale of the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, and will adopt the same.

Accordingly, after a de novo review,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the objections of defendant Braden are overruled. [Doc.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Order and Report and Recommendation of United

States Magistrate Judge is sustained, adopted and incorporated herein. [Doc. 29]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant's Motion for Disclosure of Informant and Motion to Suppress Evidence are **DENIED**. [Docs. 21 and 22]

CHARLES A. SHAW UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 30th day of July, 2008.

34]